

In the Drawings

In response to the Examiner's requirement for formal drawings, Applicant herewith submits a replacement drawing for Figure 3.

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are pending. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested since no new issues are raised by the entry of the Amendment and it places the application in condition for allowance or at least in better form for appeal.

In the Specification and Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The specification and claims were objected to for various informalities including, the alleged introduction of new matter and claims 1-6 and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Applicants have amended the specification and claims 1 and 8 to correct these informalities. No new matter is introduced by these amendments since the subject matter of these amendments can be found in the originally filed specification, claims, and drawings. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of the claims, especially in view of the above amendments, is described in such a way as to enable a person skilled in the art to make or use the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections and rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nurmohamed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,725,818). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, an apparatus for inspecting errors that includes a comparing means for outputting a first signal for the failed channel and that if the comparing means determines that the failed channel failed due to an instantaneous noise, the comparing means transmits a second signal to cancel the first signal.

Applicants respectfully submit that these features are described in the specification, especially in view of the amendments above, and that these features should be afforded patentable weight. Accordingly, Applicants substantially reiterate their previous arguments with respect to Nurmohamed.

Specifically, Nurmohamed discloses a voter circuit for a three channel redundant system. Specifically, Nurmohamed discloses that the circuit 16 detects a fault and outputs the fault to line 17 which triggers a switch (S1, S2A, or S3) to switch operation. See, for

example, Figure 1 and the Abstract. Nurmohamed does not teach or suggest that a comparing means can determine whether the failed channel failed due to noise and can accordingly, cancel a first signal.

Claim 1 also recites that the apparatus includes a signal-maintaining means for carrying out a feedback of a signal that is the same as the signals of the other channels. As discussed above, Nurmohamed merely discloses a set of switches to switch, for example, channel 1 to channel 2. The switch merely removes channel 1 from operation, so the switch does not maintain the channel as recited in claim 1. Specifically, by maintaining, rather than switching, the channel, Applicants' claim 1 allows more than one channel to fail without effecting operation of the device. In contrast, Nurmohamed's device does not support the failure of more than one channel as evidenced by Figure 1.

Accordingly, Nurmohamed fails to teach or suggest an apparatus for inspecting errors that includes a comparing means for outputting a first signal of the failed channel and that if the comparing means determines that the failed channel failed due to an instantaneous noise, the comparing means transmits a second signal to cancel the first signal and also includes a signal-maintaining means for carrying out a feedback of a signal that is the same as the signals of the other channels, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 8 is believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 because claim 8 recites features similar to the features of claim 1 discussed above.

Claims 2-6 and 9-13 are believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 8 by virtue of their dependence upon claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: 

Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: August 10, 2005